

I remember in Political Science 101 class at college, the prof started out by giving an example with speeding tickets. The conclusion of his example was that "it's not fair, damnit!" Sinclair Broadcasting's decision is a case nearly as simple as that example. I believe media consolidation is generally a threat to our democracy -- the fourth estate deserves special attention and the FCC should err on the side of fairness and multiplicity of voices.

I strongly agree with these three statements:

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.